

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
TAMPA DIVISION**

JARRETT LAFLEUR, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No. 8:20-cv-1665-T-KKM-AAS

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF  
FLORIDA, et al.,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER**

This order follows the Plaintiffs' second motion to extend the class-certification deadline. (Doc. 67). For good cause, the court may stay discovery to protect parties from annoyance, undue burden, or expense. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c); *Panola Land Buyers Ass'n v. Shuman*, 762 F.2d 1550, 1558–59 (11th Cir. 1985). Before allowing discovery to begin, district courts should attempt to resolve motions to dismiss for failure to state a claim to avoid unnecessary costs to litigants and the Court. *Chudasama v. Mazda Motor Corp.*, 123 F.3d 1353, 1367–68 (11th Cir. 1997).

The Defendants moved to dismiss the Plaintiffs' amended complaint. (Doc. 20). Rather than expending judicial resources on ongoing discovery issues and deadline-extension requests, the Court finds good cause to stay discovery until an order issues on the defendants' motion to dismiss. As a result, the following is **ORDERED**:

1. Discovery is **STAYED** pending an order on the defendants' motion to

dismiss. Within ten days of the Court's order on the defendants' motion to dismiss, the parties must meet and confer for the purpose of preparing and filing an amended Case Management Report. The amended Case Management Report must be filed on the docket within five days of the parties' meeting.

2. The Defendants' motion for protective order (Doc. 57) is **DENIED without prejudice**. The plaintiffs' unopposed motion for extension of time to file a response to the motion for protective order (Doc. 68) is **DENIED as moot**.
3. The Plaintiffs' motion to extend the class certification deadline (Doc. 67) is **DENIED as moot**.

**ORDERED** in Tampa, Florida, on March 23, 2021.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kathryn Kimball Mizelle  
United States District Judge